

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION (CINCINNATI)**

DARLLEL ORR,	:	Case No. 1:25-cv-00047
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	District Judge Douglas R. Cole
	:	Magistrate Judge Caroline H. Gentry
vs.	:	
	:	
CYNTHIA DAVIS (SOCF WARDEN)	:	
SOUTHEAST CORRECTIONAL	:	
FACILITY, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

This civil rights case is before the Court to consider Plaintiff’s “Motion to Compel Certified Service of Process At Place of Confinement.” (Doc. No. 3.) Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding without the assistance of counsel, asks the Court to compel the Clerk of Court to send all case filings to him by certified mail. (*Id.*)

This case is in its early stages. It was opened on the Court’s docket on January 31, 2025.¹ (Doc. No. 1.) The case was assigned to District Judge Douglas R. Cole and some matters referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and the Court’s Amended General Order 22-05. On February 11, 2025, to help ensure that

¹ The Complaint bears an institutional stamp indicating that it was “SCANNED AT SOCF and E-Mailed” to the Court thirty days earlier, on January 1, 2025. (Doc. No. 1-2 at PageID 10.) The date on the stamp appears to be a clerical error, as Plaintiff did not sign the emailed Complaint and *In Forma Pauperis* Affidavit until January 27, 2025. (See Doc. No. 1-2 at PageID 17; Doc. No. 1 at PageID 7.) The Clerk of Court’s internal records reflect that the Clerk received the email containing these initiating documents on January 31, 2025.

Plaintiff would receive all mailings from the Court, the undersigned ordered the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and its employees and staff to treat mail from this Court to Plaintiff as “legal mail” under its policy. (*See* Doc. No. 2.)

Plaintiff’s Motion, dated a few days later on February 16, 2025, may have crossed in the mail with the Court’s Order. (Doc. Nos. 2, 3.) Although Plaintiff expresses concern in the Motion that there will be future mail delays, he does not allege that any mail has actually been delayed. (Doc. No. 3.)

The Court therefore **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion at this time, without prejudice. (Doc. No. 3.) Plaintiff may re-file his motion if he experiences or continues to experience delays with his mail from this Court. The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to send Plaintiff a print-out of the case docket and another copy of the mail order (Doc. No. 2) for his records.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Caroline H. Gentry
Caroline H. Gentry
United States Magistrate Judge